

1812

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 6

understanding of our political processes and the functioning of our National Government by the citizens of the United States; and

Whereas the durability of a constitutional democracy is dependent upon alert, talented, vigorous competition for political leadership; and

Whereas individual Senators have cooperated with various private and university undergraduate and graduate fellowship and internship programs relating to the work of Congress; and

Whereas, in the high schools of the United States, there exists among students who have been elected to student-body offices in their sophomore, junior, or senior year a potential reservoir of young citizens who are experiencing their first responsibilities of service to a constituency and who should be encouraged to deepen their interest in and understanding of their country's political processes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby expresses its willingness to cooperate in a nationwide competitive high school Senate youth program which would give several representative high school students from each State a short indoctrination into the operation of the United States Senate and the Federal Government generally, if such a program can be satisfactorily arranged and completely supported by private funds with no expense to the Federal Government.

Sec. 2. The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration shall investigate the possibility of establishing such a program and, if the committee determines such a program is possible and advisable, it shall make the necessary arrangements to establish the program.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brewster in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MONEYMAKING G-MEN

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, many persons are aware of the very fine job the Federal Bureau of Investigation does in apprehending criminals, recovering stolen property, and gathering evidence with which criminals are successfully prosecuted. Many persons appreciate the dedicated service of the gallant men of the FBI and the very fine leadership which has been afforded that organization by J. Edgar Hoover. But probably very few persons realize that the FBI more than pays its own way. Actually, in the last fiscal year the FBI produced approximately \$200 million from fines, savings, and recoveries, which amounted to approximately \$70 million more than its annual budget.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, as part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "Money-making G-Men," from the Washington Star of February 5, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MONEYMAKING G-MEN

Senator DIRKSEN was not overstating the case when he said, "the record of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for 1962, under the diligent and expert leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, is truly spectacular."

Everything in the record comfortably supports that description, including the conviction of 12,700 persons in FBI cases, the capture of 11,400 fugitives, and the recovery of 19,000 autos. Yet even these achievements pale alongside another item Senator Dirksen might justifiably have described as supercolossal. This is simply that, in these days of sky's-the-limit Government spending, the FBI more than paid its own way.

Of course, the FBI has revenue-making opportunities not found in every Government agency. But only by its efficiency was it able to produce more than \$200 million from fines, savings, and recoveries. This amounted to some \$70 million more than its annual budget. So among all the other reasons for being appreciative of Mr. Hoover's operatives, one must also not forget their spectacular solvency.

INQUIRY BY PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE INTO CUBAN MILITARY BUILDUP

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in view of recent speculations and discussions of the procedures which should be followed by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee in its inquiry into the Cuban military situation, I would like to make a brief statement on this subject.

With respect to the suggestions that the subcommittee hearings be held in public, I remind the Senate that, as chairman of the subcommittee, I have publicly announced that it would be our purpose to make public all facts to the fullest extent permitted by national security considerations. Senators may be sure that we fully recognize that the American people have a vital stake in this matter and have the right to be informed as fully as possible about this serious problem.

However, we must recognize that certain aspects of the hearings will unavoidably deal with matters of the highest sensitivity which directly affect our national security. In such cases, we will have no alternative except to hold our hearings in executive session. It will be our purpose, however, to hold open hearings whenever this is possible, and even when closed hearings are necessary we plan to work out a method whereby a sanitized version of the presentations to the subcommittee can be released.

This is a legislative investigation by a duly constituted legislative subcommittee. Under the circumstances, the subcommittee itself must be free to exercise its own sound discretion as to which hearings can be open and which must be closed. No person outside of the subcommittee can make this determination for us. It is obvious that if all hearings were opened, as some seem to advocate, the hearings will either seriously injure our security or else prove worthless, because witnesses, under the law, could not speak of their full knowledge.

In addition, I would like to say that I have taken note of the welter of

charges and countercharges which have occurred in ever-increasing numbers since the subcommittee investigation was announced. Some of these have added to the already existing fog of doubt and uncertainty about the facts in this matter.

The subcommittee investigation has as its primary purpose the development of the true facts and the clearing away of the doubt and uncertainty. We are going to act just as vigorously and as expeditiously as possible in doing this. We want all of the facts and the entire truth to be known.

Therefore, if any person, either in or out of the Congress, has real, substantial and credible evidence which would be of value and assistance to the subcommittee in this matter I say now that we would like to have it as soon as possible. I must emphasize, however, that we are looking for hard and tangible evidence and not for unsubstantiated rumors and suspicions. Also, except in cases where this is clearly improper, we would expect the source of the information to be revealed—at least in the privacy of the subcommittee. We urge Senators or Representatives who may have valid information bearing on this subject to present it to us. We assure them it will be fully pursued.

CONDITIONS IN CUBA

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it is my hope that the lengthy debate on the Senate rules will come to a conclusion in the near future, because there are many matters of great importance which this body should take up and should look into, particularly in the areas of foreign affairs, national security, and defense of the free world.

I think the American people are becoming increasingly aware of the menace to the peace and security of this hemisphere that is posed by the Soviet arms buildup in Cuba. I believe the American people should also be aware that in this country there are a number of Cuban people who are dedicated to the proposition of returning to their homes and to the establishment in Cuba of a free society.

In my opinion, one of the most poignant articles I have seen on the plight of the Cuban refugees in this country was published on February 6 in the Washington Evening Star. The article was written by the very able and piercing analyst of foreign affairs and of our Nation's role in international politics, Eric Sevareid. In it he pointed out:

The joy over the returned heroes of the Bay of Pigs was short lived; the fiery, promising words of President Kennedy in the Miami Stadium faded from the conversation or are repeated in ironic echoes. The demurrer of the Attorney General on the question of the air support came like a whiplash in their faces.

The fact that they may be truly lost is beginning to penetrate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEXT DOOR TO THE CUBAN TRAGEDY—EXILES WILL LIVE IN A STATE OF SUSPENSION TILL THEY KNOW THEY CAN RETURN OR NOT
(By Eric Sevareid)

KEY WEST.—This is where freedom comes to a point.

The southeastern tip of this southernmost fragment of the United States is a low stone seawall curving from the Navy installation, along the George Smathers public beach, past the Howard Johnson emporium, the long row of established fishing boats, and the Food Fair until Roosevelt Boulevard becomes Truman Avenue. At the corner of Truman Avenue and Margaret Street stands the Margaret Truman laundrette.

Key West, part Spanish, part Anglo-American, is an architectural mish-mash of lovely, balconied New Orleans style frame houses lost in a neon-lighted nightmare of gas stations, shops, and joints. The tourists are few, middle-aged and middle-western. Youth consists of pairs and trios of bored U.S. sailors drifting along Duval Street under the eye of the shore patrol. The cars move at sedate speeds, the pelicans glide very slowly, and even gulls seem rarely to scream. It is the frequent jet fighter planes on patrol that supply the vigor and the sound.

The tip of freedom points toward Cuba which is closer than Miami, and easily penetrates the azure curtain of sea and sky. One has only to switch the television knob to channel five and Castro, communism, and the new songs of old Cuba, lyrics by ideologists, suddenly fill one's motel bedroom with clamor and tense reality. Nothing but the sea and the sky separate this place from the tragedy, ever present in the faces and the conversations of Cuban waiters, chambermaids, drivers, and fishermen all over this raddled spit of land.

From here the refugees are scattered, all the way up the keys, through and to the north of Miami, their mecca of desperation, their gathering and their festering place. There the complete agony is assembled out of its tens of thousands of human parts—the pride, the soul sickness, the blind but urgent hopes, the shapeless plans to somehow plan. The joy over the returned heroes of the Bay of Pigs was short lived; the fiery, promising words of President Kennedy in the Miami Stadium fade from the conversation or are repeated in ironic echoes. The demurrer of the Attorney General on the question of the air support came like a whiplash in their faces.

The fact that they may be truly lost is beginning to penetrate. They are a passionate people; they speak their bitterness as readily as they spoke their gratitude. The State of Florida and the Federal Government have an enormous and growing problem on their hands. Every living Cuban here asks himself and his friends the daily question, spoken or unspoken: Are we going back? There is no answer. If an official answer does come and it is affirmative, with evidence to support it, they will remain together and live only for the day of their return. If the answer is negative, they would explode, but sooner or later they would begin to dull the pain and to think in terms of assimilation to North American life. One way or another, their life would go on with some meaning and purpose. But today they exist in a state of suspension, their feet not on the ground nor their heads in the clouds. Prolonged, this will prove unendurable.

The other side of this coin is the dilemma of the U.S. Government. It can issue general assurances, as the President did in Miami, but it cannot support the assurance with public proof of specific plans. There is

a difference between an official attitude and an official policy. For this slowly festering pool of displaced humanity there in Florida an attitude very soon will not be enough. A positive policy, even if short of armed invasion, but promising a specific schedule of pressures severe enough to realistically foreshadow Castro's downfall, would seem to justify the idea of a Cuban government-in-exile, for a host of useful purposes, including Cuban cohesion in Florida now and limiting the anarchy and fraternal violence in Cuba later.

It would also permit and inspire serious advance thinking here about the nature of the post-Castro Cuban political and social order. It is these formulations for the future that responsible Cubans here now wish to get on with. It is a new vision of Cuban life in liberty and social justice, thought out in some detail, that ought to be crackling through the airwaves now, to the ears of all within that island fortress. They ought to hear it night after night, as they now hear the mechanical drumbeat of communism's slogans, insults, and alibis. Where the vision is unstated, as where there is no vision, people perish, whether in their homes or abroad and seeking to find their homes.

THE GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, recently the distinguished President of the German Federal Republic, popularly known as West Germany, addressed the people of the Soviet occupied zone. I should like to read the address delivered by Dr. Heinrich Lübke, the President of free Germany, because I believe it well expresses the sense, the will, the determination and the preoccupation of the people of West Germany—indeed, the people of all Germany, East and West—who passionately desire a reunified Germany. In his address Dr. Lübke said:

My dear countrymen in central Germany and East Berlin, for over 17 years central Germany has been under the totalitarian rule of a small minority, who, backed up by Soviet military power, stifles any impulse toward political and personal freedom. These functionaries have taken it upon themselves to direct the thoughts and actions of the population. Free elections, free speech, and the unfoldment of the personality, it is true, are familiar concepts to all of you, my countrymen. You, however, are denied the possibility of putting these concepts into practice.

In 1962 this lack of freedom was aggravated by the disastrous effects of the regime's mismanagement of agriculture, trade, and industry. Of what use is your diligence, your expert knowledge, and your experience, if everything is thwarted by the incompetence of the functionaries of your regime? As a result of collectivization, central Germany, whose pride was once a prosperous agriculture, has suffered acute supply problems. In both urban and rural districts, there is a lack of the most basic necessities of daily life. Because neither parts nor raw materials can be procured, the machines have come to a complete standstill in some plants. The failure to meet the production quota of the national economic plan has to be compensated by overtime work and additional shifts. With the aid of the worker's council and trade unions, the workers in West Germany are able to negotiate with the management on equal terms. They can barely comprehend that you, who are represented by the so-called Free German Federation of Trade Unions, are forced to more than fulfill the standards, and that you are assigned ever greater working obligations, which exceed

your strength, and that yet, your people do not reap any benefits from all this. Of late, it has come to the point that your children are not even allowed to choose the profession to which they are disposed. Instead they have to pursue professions, which will further the realization of the national economic plan. By the use of brutal and violent measures, the rupture of the intercourse between you and your fellow countrymen in the Federal Republic was effected. Since the erection of the wall, parents have been separated from their children, relatives from relatives, friend from friends. But we Germans, whether in the east, the west, the north, or the south of our fatherland, are and will always remain a spiritual community—therefore one nation. Your grief and your suffering, despite our forced separation, is our grief and our suffering as well.

None of us know when the hour of freedom will strike. One thing, however, may be said: The aspirations of the Communists to make the division of Germany and of Berlin a permanent one and to keep 17 million Germans in bondage have diminished rather than increased during the course of the last year.

Dear countrymen, in your fight for justice and for freedom you do not stand alone. In our talks with leading political figures, no stone is left unturned in our efforts to awaken interest in your destiny. Again and again we strive to convince the world that you, like all, must be granted the right of self-determination.

Throughout the whole world, allies arise to defend your cause, especially where the checking of Communist expansion is concerned. In Berlin, in Cuba, at the Indian-Chinese border, your cause is being defended. It will fill you with hope to know that, despite all pessimistic forecasts, the freedom and independence of West Berlin was sustained throughout the past year. Firm resolution, patience, and the unity of the West, led to a success in the Cuban crisis. And when the time is ripe, these same qualities will regain Germany's freedom and unity.

Several times each year I go to Berlin, the old, present, and future capital of Germany. Not least among my motivations is the desire, my dear countrymen, to show you that I am united to you in spirit.

Our common goal is and remains an undivided free Germany. Let us hope that the year 1963 will bring us an important step closer to the attainment of this goal.

That concludes the address by the Right Honorable Dr. Heinrich Lübke, President of the German Federal Republic. It is my sincere hope that we as Americans will always be determined to join with them in any practical and effective effort to achieve the reunification of Germany under a free government.

CONDITIONS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, our problems throughout this world are many. We have crises in virtually every corner of the globe. Today we have talked about Cuba and Germany. We must note, too, that we ourselves have contributed to some of the unstable conditions that exist in the great continent of Africa.

Troops of the United Nations have crushed Tshombe, Katangan leader, and the Belgian Congo is out of the headlines at the moment. The backers of our policy in the Congo are saying, in effect,

"Nothing succeeds like success." But to anyone knowing the African situation, it is apparent that the defeat of Tshombe settles nothing. The situation in the Congo is chaotic and menacing. Our Government still is pursuing an African policy which parallels Communist aims and objectives, and which is inimical to the best interests of this country and of the so-called Dark Continent.

In the Congo we have backed Adoula, at best a neutralist and perhaps very far to the left. We have done so on the theory that, in some manner, we were thus preventing a head-on clash with Soviet Russia. At least, that is how I interpret the labored excuse we give for aggression. I could never understand the argument that in fighting Tshombe, we were in some hush-hush, mysterious way, fighting communism. I could never understand the contention that we should back independence for small areas all over Africa and deny independence to Katanga. I think our Government's explanation for our attack on Katanga is one of the lamest, most tortured, most unconvincing explanations of an official policy that I have ever heard. But this cannot gainsay the defeat of Tshombe, whose pro-Western sentiments have cost him dearly. After the U.N. victory, a victory by the agency created to keep the peace, the question arises: What next?

There are, in the Belgian Congo, the problems left by disorder, incompetency, and tribal animosities. There are more than 200 tribes in the Belgian Congo; total income is around \$160 million annually, of which \$80 million comes from the outside, but the Congolese are spending at the rate of \$400 million a year. This country already has given the Belgian Congo about \$170 million for non-military assistance. We spent quite a hefty sum in helping defeat Tshombe, a figure which will run into the millions. Pretty soon, American taxpayers will be asked to pay more to keep up the Adoula government, as well as to pick up another tab for the U.N. Meanwhile, we have other troubles inside the Congo.

One of the strangest and most sinister developments dates back to last summer. From Léopoldville the Congo's Foreign Minister, Justin Bokombo, announced that his Government had donated an area about 75 miles, northwest of Thysville, to be used as a training ground for guerrillas who planned—and still plan apparently—to invade Angola, a nearby Portuguese province.

Later, Holden Roberto, leader of the terrorist band which invaded northern Angola in March 1961, announced the formation of a government-in-exile to be based on Belgian Congo soil.

Still later, Ahmed Ben Bella, Algerian leader and friend of Fidel Castro, announced he was ready to send troops to Angola as part of the continuing struggle against imperialism in Africa. After this announcement, made in a speech in Algiers, Ben Bella urged Arab unity, first among Tunisia, Morocco, and Algeria and then among all the Arab nations. This integration and unity is a favorite theme of the Egyptian dictator, Nasser. It portends Arab unity, very far indeed.

The Tunisians have indicated their cooperation in the effort to drive the Portuguese out of Africa. One of the leaders in the war on the Portuguese is Mario de Andrade, president of the movement for the liberty of Angola, has been in Algiers to recruit volunteers for the drive on the Portuguese.

Andrade is regarded as a Communist. The France Presse, French News agency, carried a story on Monday, February 4, 1963, about the opening of a headquarters for the MPLA, Andrade's Angolan faction, in Algiers. Ben Bella spoke and pledged aid to Andrade's outfit, comparing the fight the latter is making on the Portuguese to his own campaign against the French. At the ceremony, according to the news agency, were the Russian, Czech, and Red Chinese Ambassadors.

We are helping Ben Bella now, and only a few days ago Mennen Williams was in Algiers talking about more aid to the Algerian leader.

We are helping Adoula in the Congo, Tunisia, Ghana, and other countries in Africa which have indicated they will assist in the drive on our ally, Portugal. Thus we are underwriting a good part of the campaign to drive the Portuguese out of Africa. Some of our help seems to be going indirectly to Roberto and some to Andrade, the Communist, who has Ben Bella's backing. In any event, we are supporting Portugal's foes and, in so doing, are backing Communist goals.

Roberto and Andrade have been feuding, apparently over leadership of the rebel movement in Angola. But, while Andrade's ties to the Communists are well known and well documented, Roberto also has his links with the Reds.

The book "Africa's Red Harvest," by Pieter Lessing, journalist and African authority, charges that the Communists aided actively in the outbreak in Angola in 1961, an affair in which Roberto led the anti-Portuguese forces.

Lessing, whose reputation as an African authority is a very good one, says the uprising in Angola traced back to the arrival at Conakry, the capital of Guinea, of Daniel Semenovitch Solod, as Soviet Ambassador in 1960. Solod got in contact with Roberto, de Andrade, and other anti-Portuguese leaders. Lessing states that the Guinean Russian Ambassador helped organize the attack on Angola and that Roberto, who became the leader, got both arms and funds from Communist sources. Prior to the invasion of Angola from the Congo, inflammatory Communist radio propaganda was beamed into the Portuguese African territories, including Angola. This went on for about 6 months prior to the attack on Angola by Roberto's terrorists in March 1961. The invaders tortured, raped, and butchered without mercy, sparing no one, regardless of age or sex. In the summer of 1961, Roberto was quoted in *Le Monde*, a Paris newspaper, as saying he ordered the slaying of women and children in Angola, feeling that such atrocities were necessary to drive out the Portuguese. Apparently, the Portuguese have been driven out of view.

We have, then, on the soil of the Belgian Congo, an armed camp, established for the purpose of invading the territory of a friendly nation, Portugal.

I should like to point out, Mr. President, that Angola is considered legally a part of Metropolitan Portugal. So, of course, any issues raised on Angola should properly be considered internal matters.

Undoubtedly, unless something intervenes, the attack will be made. If it does take place, I think Portugal, our NATO ally, will be justified in saying that this country has aided and abetted the attempt to drive the Portuguese out of Africa. The maintenance of the camp on the soil of the former Belgian Congo also is a violation of the U.N. Charter, but nowadays the Afro-Asian bloc, which controls the world organization, suffers from color blindness. The U.N., whose prestige is falling steadily, sees only the things the Afro-Asian bloc wants it to see.

While the U.N. did the fighting, the real power behind the drive against Tshombe was the United States. The real power behind Adoula is the United States. If we continue to support Adoula and to help maintain his government, we are cooperating, willingly or unwillingly, in the fight which is to be waged on an ally. This circumstance, together with events of the past, will lead the Portuguese to feel that this mighty country has conspired with its enemies to dismember it and to destroy their nation. Approximately 25 percent of European Portugal's export trade is with her overseas provinces. The bulk of this trade is provided by Angola and Mozambique.

If Angola and Mozambique are wrested from Portugal, the fall of the Salazar government is a possibility. The ousting of the Portuguese premier, strongly anti-Communist and staunchly pro-Western, long has been an objective of the Communists and the leftists. In turn, the succession of a pro-Communist government in Portugal is not unlikely. This is what happened in Cuba, which is one of the biggest headaches the United States has today. We withdrew support from Batista and caused his fall on the grounds that he was a dictator and a bad man. We got Castro instead. If it were to do over again, I suspect that some of our liberals, so prone to moral judgments, would be glad to reswap Cuban rulers, which, of course, is impossible.

Mr. President, let me say that I have no brief for dictators of the Batista stripe, but we seem to have a double standard of morality in our approach to totalitarian governments. We seem to feel that rightwing dictatorships are eminently bad, but that leftwing dictators are really humanitarian in their orientation and are far less oppressive and more popular among the people.

I submit that this simply is not true. However much we may despise dictatorship in any form, I submit that the leftwing dictators whom our country is supporting throughout the world are certainly no better than rightwing dictators. Actually rightwing dictators, for the most part, are pro-Western in their foreign policies. They do not seek to impose their political and economic